



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

FEBRUARY MEETING, 1894.

THE stated meeting was held on Thursday, the 8th instant, at three o'clock, P. M. ; the President, Dr. GEORGE E. ELLIS, in the chair.

In the absence of the Recording Secretary, Mr. SAMUEL F. McCLEARY was appointed Secretary, *pro tempore*.

The record of the last stated meeting and the list of donors to the library were then read.

Communications from the Third Section having been called for, Mr. R. C. WINTHROP, JR., said : —

At the close of a friendly encounter between Mr. Adams and myself, on the subject of his recently published book, I mentioned to him that while I had no intention of again taking up the cudgels on behalf of the historians of Massachusetts, I was disposed to say something more about Emmanuel Downing, but that, in so doing, I should bear in mind his injunction to abstain from unseemly levity. It may be remembered that one of my criticisms was that Mr. Adams, as it appeared to me, had conveyed the impression that from the outset the friends of the Massachusetts Bay Colony in England disapproved of the severities practised here towards those who differed in opinion, and I pointed out that two important letters quoted by him were written many years after the banishment of either Roger Williams or Mrs. Hutchinson and referred to a subsequent state of things. I added that if I were asked for evidence of the state of feeling among friends of the Colony in England at the period of the Antinomian controversy, I should rely somewhat upon a letter of Emmanuel Downing, written only a few weeks after the adjournment of the Synod of 1637, in which he says : —

“ Here [in London] hath been great joy for your great victories, but far more for vanquishing your erroneous opinions than for conquering the Pequots. Our best and worthiest men do much marvel you did not

banish Wheelwright and Hutchinson's wife, but suffer them to sow more sedition among you. Mr. Vane's ill behavior there hath lost all his reputation here."

I then went on to say that by the phrase "our best and worthiest men," Downing undoubtedly referred to prominent persons in the Liberal party, both in and out of Parliament, with whom he is known to have been intimate, and that he probably included several high officials who, as I had shown in an earlier part of my paper, honored him with their confidence and were kindly disposed towards Massachusetts.

In his very able and interesting reply to me Mr. Adams invalidated this testimony by quoting, as he was quite justified in doing, some extremely disparaging remarks about Downing, first printed more than six and twenty years ago, in the "North American Review," by our late associate, James Russell Lowell, who then undertook to pass in review all the Winthrop Papers published by this Society up to that time, including not merely the two separate volumes then recently edited for us by Mr. Charles Deane, but the selections which had previously appeared in others of our Collections. Mr. Lowell thus had before him something like a thousand letters, mostly of the early colonial period and some of them very long ones, concerning which he produced an interesting and valuable article, which attracted deserved attention, and to which he subsequently assigned the place of honor in the second volume of his collected essays, entitling it "New England Two Centuries Ago."¹

In dealing with this mass of material, it is not to be wondered at that Mr. Lowell should have found time to examine portions of it only cursorily, and that, by oversight or haste, some little inaccuracies of statement should have resulted, several of which occur in the passage quoted by Mr. Adams, which I am now about to read to you again. The author had been speaking of men for whom, he says, our respect is heightened by these letters; and he continues as follows:—

"Two other men, Emmanuel Downing and Hugh Peter, leave a positively unpleasant savor in the nostrils. Each is selfish in his own way, — Downing with the shrewdness of an attorney, Peter with that clerical unction which in a vulgar nature easily degenerates into greasiness.

¹ The date 1865 is attached to this essay, which is probably the year in which it was written, but it did not appear in print until October, 1867.

Neither of them was the man for a forlorn hope, and both returned to England when the civil war opened prospect of preferment there. Both, we suspect, were inclined to value their Puritanism for its rewards in this world rather than the next. Downing's son, Sir George, was basely prosperous, making the good cause pay him so long as it was solvent, and then selling out in season to betray his old commander, Colonel Okey, to the shambles at Charing Cross."

With regard to this last sentence I will merely say that the act of baseness attributed to George Downing occurred after his father's death, and is hardly pertinent to any discussion of his father's character and conduct. As to Hugh Peter, no less than seven of the seventy-six pages of this essay are devoted to him; but to save time I will strictly confine myself to what is said of him in the passage just cited. An English correspondent of mine once asked me if I could furnish him with any particulars about Hugh Peter not to be found in ordinary works of reference, and I accordingly sent him the volume containing the thirty-five letters of Peter's here criticised. In reply he wrote me, "These letters were quite a surprise. I had no idea he was so warm-hearted." I mention this only to show the diversity of impression sometimes produced upon different readers of the same correspondence. Had Mr. Lowell contented himself with pronouncing Peter an unpleasantly selfish, vulgar fellow, I could have taken no exception to such an expression of opinion; but, in addition, what I think a misleading statement is made about him. Suppose, if such a thing were possible, some one in this room this afternoon had never before heard of Hugh Peter the regicide. What idea would he obtain from the assertion that he "returned to England when the civil war opened prospect of preferment"? He could hardly fail to suppose that not long after the civil war broke out in 1642, Peter left New England in order to seek employment in the mother country; whereas it is a matter of record that when the news of the civil war reached Boston, Peter had been absent from New England nearly fifteen months, and that he had gone abroad upon no private errand, but as the accredited agent of the Massachusetts Bay Colony, a position he held four years. It was not till 1645, three years after the war began, that he was again in private station and had the alternative of returning to Salem after so prolonged an absence or of embracing military service under Parliament.

He may not, as Mr. Lowell intimates, have been the man to lead a forlorn hope, but, at any rate, he chose the path of danger, and it was one which led him eventually to the block. I think it not unlikely that ambition had something to do with his not going back, but it seems fair to suppose that the distressing condition of his home may have partly influenced him, his second wife having become afflicted with a disordered mind. I may add, before dropping this part of my subject, that, although Hugh Peter undoubtedly inclined to severity during the two first years of his sojourn here, yet he afterward appears more tolerant, as in an interesting letter from England in September, 1646, he exclaims: "None will come to you [in New England] because you persecute. Cannot you mend it?" If Mr. Adams has not already noticed this evidence of a change of heart, it may tend to mollify his opinion of the writer.

Now, as to Emmanuel Downing, nearly sixty of whose letters were contained in the volumes then under review, besides numerous references to him in the letters of others. Had Mr. Lowell contented himself with characterizing him as unpleasantly shrewd and selfish, — "a hard, practical man," and "a perfunctory person," as he styles him on other pages, — he would have been fully entitled to express such an opinion; but, in addition, he indulged in a misleading statement, resulting from some strange misapprehension. As the name Emmanuel Downing is, as a rule, familiar only to the comparatively limited number of students of our early colonial history, there might well have been present at the January meeting members who knew little about him; and, if so, what impression would they have obtained from the assertion that he "returned to England when the civil war opened prospect of preferment"? They would surely have supposed that not long after the civil war broke out in 1642 Downing left New England in order to seek employment in the mother country; whereas it is a matter of record that Downing continued to make his home in Salem for more than twelve years after the breaking out of that war!

The facts are briefly these: Letters of John Humfrey, Isaac Johnson, and others show Downing to have been actively interested in the plantation at least as early as 1629. He invested money in the enterprise, sent out his son James in 1630, but remained behind to settle his affairs and look

after the interests of his associates. For reasons unnecessary to describe, he was delayed in England much longer than he first expected, and did not reach here until October, 1638, when he took up his abode in Salem, where he resided sixteen years, occasionally representing that town in the General Court, but chiefly occupying himself in the development of the industrial resources of the Colony in agriculture, mining, and distilling. During that period his business interests twice caused him to visit England, but he returned as soon as he was able, and his letters show his absences to have been devoted to procuring men and money for the iron-works and prosecuting unsettled claims. With a family of ten children, most of whom were dependent upon him, he was probably tempted to embark in too many ventures, several of which proved unlucky; and he suffered an additional misfortune in the destruction by fire of his house and its contents while its occupants were at church. At the end of ten years from his emigration he found himself much less well off, and on one occasion he pathetically records having sold his saddle-horse for £10 to buy a necessary piece of machinery, and how he had to foot it from Salem to Boston and back to see a friend. It is not until the spring of 1653, more than fourteen years after he settled at Salem, and nearly eleven after the breaking out of the civil war, that there occurs in these letters the slightest suggestion of a possible change in his mode of life. He then mentions that Hugh Peter had written his wife a pressing invitation to them both to visit him in England; and as Peter had lost money in one of Downing's undertakings, and was a little sore about it, this exhibition of hospitality evidently surprised the latter, for he adds, "I suspect George would have us return, and puts Mr. Peters upon the invitation," — "George" being the writer's second son, who, having greatly distinguished himself as a soldier, and been badly wounded at the battle of Dunbar, then held a high command in Scotland. Nothing, however, came of this, and Emmanuel labored on another year and a half at Salem, until, on the 25th of September, 1654, he writes: "I am now purposed, God willing, to go for England with General Sedgwick, which will be within these two months at farthest. . . . I may have much trouble about the subscription for the iron-works." Then follows one of those provoking gaps which often occur in colonial corre-

spondence where letters either miscarried or have since disappeared, the next one being dated more than three years later from Edinburgh, where the writer had been installed in some official position, of which he says "we are here in a comfortable way both for the means of grace and for the outward man." What occurred in the interval no one knows, though a side-light is thrown upon it by Hugh Peter, who wrote John Winthrop, Jr., from London in March, 1655, "Your uncle Downing is at your brother's; no preferment yet, nor debts paid." It would seem that George Downing found it cheaper to obtain public employment for his father than to enable him to arrange with his creditors and return to Salem. Emmanuel was then an old man (he was born in 1585), and did not long survive this appointment, his death having occurred in 1659, though the precise date has not yet been ascertained.

In the peroration of Mr. Adams's reply to me occur these words: "That Emmanuel Downing or Hugh Peter was a better type of the early Puritan than John Milton or John Hampden I utterly deny, and of it demand evidence." Far be it from me to assert anything of the kind. The prose writings of John Milton do not invariably convey the idea of moderation, but he was an immortal poet, and John Hampden an illustrious patriot. As compared with either of them Emmanuel Downing was an obscure person, whose only claim to popular remembrance lies in his having had it in his power at a critical period to render important services to the Massachusetts Colony. The value of those services has been generally recognized by historians, from Governor Winthrop, who spoke of him in 1639 as "a very able man who had done many good offices for the country these ten years," down to Mr. Adams himself, who in that admirable paper on Sir Christopher Gardiner read by him to us in 1883, in describing the famous hearing of the case of the Massachusetts Charter before the Privy Council, says: "On the other side, exerting themselves in the defence of their associates, were Cradock and Saltonstall and Humfrey, potently aided by Downing." He then cites contemporary testimony that Downing was "especially serviceable in this emergency," adding "it may well have been that he had access to influential personages," and so on. That Downing was an opponent of religious toleration in Massachusetts, that he thoroughly approved the successive banishments of

Roger Williams, of John Wheelwright, and of Samuel Gorton, I freely admit; and I will go even farther, and concede that one of his letters does leave an unpleasant savor in nineteenth-century nostrils,—a letter written in 1645 (alluded to both by Lowell and by Doyle), in which he advocates the employment of negro slaves as agricultural laborers, and suggests that in the event of a war with the Indians captives might profitably be exchanged for blacks. All that can be said in extenuation of a letter like that is that the writer only reflected the opinions of his age. It was not until a far later period that the conscience of England was awakened on this subject; and it is a curious fact, with which his admirers have some difficulty in dealing, that one of the earliest speeches in the House of Commons of the present Prime Minister, Mr. Gladstone, was in defence of negro slavery in the West Indies, where his family then owned estates.

If, however, as Mr. Lowell intimates, Downing was one of those men who valued their Puritanism for its rewards in this world rather than in the next, it is difficult to see why he came to New England at all. He was far advanced in middle life. Without being a rich man he was in easy circumstances, with a house in London, a farm in the country, a professional income, a large circle of friends,—to say nothing of a wife who had no particular desire to emigrate. All this he was content to sacrifice; and it does seem a little hard, when a man came over here at the age of fifty-three and labored for sixteen years, under all sorts of discouragement, to develop the industries of Massachusetts, until he found himself, at nearly seventy, in straitened circumstances, that he should now be represented as having turned his back on the Colony “when the civil war opened prospect of preferment.” In referring to his letter of November, 1637, my intention was to cite it as an important, though not necessarily a conclusive, bit of evidence. I agree with Mr. Adams that most people in England were then too busy about other matters to devote much attention to the Antinomian controversy, and among those who found time to interest themselves in it there may well have been some who were disposed to be more tolerant than Downing and his friends. All I contend for is that his intimacies were such as to justify him in speaking with a certain authority of opinions entertained by leading men of the Liberal party. Of the

character of those intimacies I gave some account in my December paper, and I will now only quote another letter of his written a few months later, in March, 1638, in which, after describing a conversation with Lord Brooke, he adds: "All things stand well in the eye of our State concerning your plantation, no word of any murmuring against it. *Your new upstart opinions are here generally cried down.*" Brooke, afterward a leading Parliamentary general, killed in action in 1643, was brother-in-law to Downing's particular friend Sir Arthur Haslerig, who, I need hardly remind you, was one of the members of Parliament whom Charles I. tried to impeach with Pym and Hampden, and subsequently one of Cromwell's staunchest Colonels. He was at one time in charge of Emmanuel Downing's affairs in England, and it was in his house that George Downing found a home when sent abroad to seek his fortune.

Before closing, I will say a few words concerning another apparent misapprehension which may seem a small matter, but readers are often influenced by comparative trifles. In his introductory footnote to the letters of Emmanuel Downing, Mr. Charles Deane described him as "a lawyer of the Inner Temple," for which Mr. Lowell saw fit to substitute the single word "attorney," which he uses more than once, and which Mr. Adams amplifies into the words "self-seeking London attorney." "Self-seeking" is a matter of opinion. "London attorney" implies a fact; in this instance, a somewhat misleading one. In England members of the legal profession not in official station may be roughly divided into three classes: first, Queen's counsel and barristers, who attend the higher courts; second, solicitors, whose occupation is chiefly conveying and the care of property; and third, attorneys, who are largely associated in the public mind with criminal procedure and actions for debt in the lower courts. The social position of an attorney being rarely so good as that of a barrister, the term "attorney" applied to an English lawyer might easily be interpreted in a sense of some little disparagement, and both Mr. Lowell and Mr. Adams appear to have so used it in speaking of Downing; if so, this resulted from a partial misunderstanding. Under the Stuart dynasty there existed a court, long since abolished, named the "Court of Wards and Liveries," the judge of which was styled "Master" and familiarly

known as the "Master of the Wards." It was a position of great dignity and emolument, while among its perquisites was the appointment of certain members of the bar to discharge in this court functions which appear to have been somewhat analogous to those of Masters in Chancery, and who were officially styled Attorneys to the Court of Wards. At the period in question the Master of the Wards was Sir Robert Naunton, a former Secretary of State to James I., well affected to the Puritans and with a liking for lawyers who came from his own county of Suffolk. By his appointment, Downing, a Suffolk man, held for several years one of these attorneyships; but aside from this he was a practising lawyer, first in Dublin, where he married for his first wife the daughter of an Irish judge, Sir James Ware, and subsequently in London, where he became a member of the Inner Temple. Without being a distinguished member of his profession, his letters show that in term-time he was a busy one, and he managed to secure a share of Parliamentary practice, thereby bringing himself into contact with members of the House of Commons.

The question may be asked why the little inaccuracies to which I have alluded, and others of which it was not pertinent for me to speak, were not brought to our attention long ago; and thereby hangs a tale. Soon after the article appeared in the "North American," it became known that Mr. Lowell was the author of it; and the concluding paragraph — a paragraph not included in the collected essays — contained two sentences not wholly agreeable to our lamented associate, Charles Deane. In one of them, while complimenting Mr. Deane's fidelity as an editor, the reviewer observed that he had "noticed a few errors here and there." In the other, a recognition of the "valuable, instructive, and entertaining matter" contained in the thirty-seven volumes of the Society's Collections then in print was qualified by the remark that they also contained "much that is worthless." Mr. Deane was jealous of the reputation of a society to which he devoted so large a part of his life, he was not prepared to admit we had ever published much worthless material, nor was he conscious of any errors worth mentioning in a review of two volumes in editing which he had taken so much pains. To say that he was offended would be to use too strong a word, but he was undoubtedly a little nettled that one of his associates should have indulged in such

public criticism, and he felt strongly tempted to offer a little in return. Upon consultation, however, with his colleagues on the Committee, it was decided to let the matter drop until some opportunity should arise for bringing it up in discussion, an opportunity which has certainly been a long time on the road.

If I have dwelt at some length upon the character and conduct of Emmanuel Downing, it has not been wholly on account of what was said here of him a month ago, but also because I have reason to know that quite a number of persons are interested in learning more about him. He left behind in New England five married children, and descendants of some of them have so multiplied that I am occasionally in receipt of inquiries concerning him from total strangers as well as from personal acquaintances. Of our living Resident Members, at least one, Professor Norton, is a descendant of his; and it was only the other day that another, Professor Smyth, mentioned to me that his wife is similarly descended. A few months ago, Mr. Joseph James Muskett, an English antiquarian engaged on an elaborate work entitled "Suffolk Manorial Families," sent me a Downing pedigree, with the request that I would correct and amplify it, which I was particularly glad to do because of the errors and omissions with which most notices of the Downings are studded, the account in Savage's Genealogical Dictionary being especially unreliable, as at the time Mr. Savage prepared it few Downing letters had come to light. In England it has been even worse. Some older members may perhaps remember that when my father wrote an introduction to the entertaining letters of the second wife of Emmanuel Downing published by us in 1871, he drew attention to an amusing blunder of the historian Buckle, who had gravely stated that this lady's son George was a charity-boy of unknown parentage and probably illegitimate!¹ Buckle was an omnivorous reader with a very retentive memory; but somehow or other the idea escaped him that within his easy reach, in the British Museum and elsewhere, were works of reference which would have told him George Downing was a graduate of Harvard, and who his father was. It occurs to me to add that the work of Mr. Muskett, to which I have just alluded, is now passing through the press, and will contain all that has been

¹ 5 Mass. Hist. Coll., vol. i. p. xxxiii. See also Proceedings, vol. iv. p. 128.

gradually ascertained concerning the Suffolk Downings, though some facts and dates are still missing.

Dr. SAMUEL A. GREEN then read the following communication:—

Among the recently discovered Bowdoin Papers, mentioned by Mr. Robert C. Winthrop, Jr., at a meeting of this Society more than a year ago, is the following Agreement signed by members of the General Court. It is in the handwriting of the Honorable James Bowdoin, Jr., whose father was then Governor of the Commonwealth, and who himself was afterward Minister to Spain. The Agreement was drawn up during the session of 1786, as in that year all the signers were members of the Legislature; and Artemas Ward, whose name heads the list, was then Speaker of the House. On November 17, 1786, a Report of a Joint Special Committee was adopted, which deals in part with subjects contained in this paper. See also "The Massachusetts Centinel" (Boston), November 29, 1786, for other facts. The document is of special interest at the present time, when some of the topics embodied in it are attracting so much attention throughout the country.

Whereas the Excessive use of Articles of foreign growth and manufacture, has been attended with the most pernicious consequences;— by depriving us of our circulating Mædium, and by diffusing a Taste for foreign Frippery, Dress & Extravagance. And Whereas it is of the utmost Importance, to encourage Industry, Frugality and our own Manufactures;—to recover a circulating Mædium, to restore public Credit, and to facilitate the Payment of public and private Debts; and thereby to promote the Welfare & Happiness of our Country: With a View to these, and other salutary Purposes: We, the Subscribers, do hereby enter into a solemn Agreement and Association, to refrain from, & as far as in our power to prevent, the excessive use and Consumption of Articles of foreign Manufacture, especially Articles of Luxury & Extravagance. And We do hereby engage to use our utmost Influence to promote Associations for the abovementioned Purposes in the several Towns we represent.

Artemas Ward
Caleb Davis
Aaron Whitney
W^m Shepard

Jas Bowdoin jr
John Carnes.
Hez. Ward
Isaac Thomson

Sam ^l Thompson	Benj. Shepard
David Smead	Nath ^l Marsh
Walter M ^c Farland	James Endicott
Sam ^l Fisk	Ezra Sargeant
Joshua Holt	Benjamin Read
Savel Metcalf	Joseph Hewins
Asahel Wheeler	John Coffin Jones
Robert Hamilton	Joshua Thomas
Jon ^a Hale	Eben ^t Thayer jun ^r
Eben ^t Washburn	John Treadwell
Samuel Moody	Tho ^a Dawes
Jonathan Ward	Nicholas Baylies
Edward Barns	Benj ^a Brown
Benj ^a Bates	Tho. Clarke
Timothy Sibley	Joseph Curtis
Isaac Tobey	John Stinton
Seth Smith Jur	Zacheus Beal
Benjamin Sheldon	Stephen Maynard
Azariah Ashley	Israel Vinal Ju ^r
John Choate	Leonard Williams
Atherton Hall	Jon ^a Brown
Ebenezer Tyler	Saml Harnden
Joseph Farnham	J. Brooks.
W ^m W Cobb	Noah M Littlefield 58
David Nye	John Williams
Sam A Otis	Leo: Jarvis

Dr. GREEN continued : —

More than a year ago I was authorized by our Vice-President, Mr. Charles Francis Adams, to buy a set of rare German prints, whenever or wherever I could find one, which represent views in the town of Boston during the Revolutionary period. Within a few weeks, at a sale in New York, I have succeeded in procuring these engravings, which now in Mr. Adams's name are given to the Society. They are four in number, 12 inches by 15½ in size, and are rather interesting, — on the *lucus a non lucendo* principle, — inasmuch as they probably represent nothing that ever existed in this city. Apparently the original sketches were drawn by an artist who received a verbal description of the places from some person who may have been here. The prints were engraved by François Xavier Habermann, a native of Glatz in Silesia,

where he was born in 1721, but who for many years lived in Augsburg, where he was a well known engraver and publisher, until his death in 1796. The legend underneath each one is given both in German and French, and in the left-hand upper corner is the inscription, "Collection des Prospects." The set now given to the Society is colored, and belongs to a series of Views, made on copper; though a set in the possession of the Boston Public Library is not colored. Perhaps the pictures appeared originally in a volume and also as separate prints. I have seen four similar engravings of Views in New York, several of Views in Philadelphia, and four of Views in Quebec, all made by the same engraver, and also published in Augsburg. Our associate, Mr. William H. Whitmore, tells me that he has seen one of the Views of Quebec, just alluded to, which was identical with one of the Boston pictures, though I have never had an opportunity myself to compare the two side by side.

While there is no date whatever on the copies now given, there is a slight clew on some of the others as to the time when they were made. The Views in New York represent the Destruction of the Royal Statue, which took place on July 10, 1776; the Triumphal Entry of the Royal Troops, and the Disembarkment of the English Troops, both occurring on September 15 of that year; and the Fire in New York on the night of September 21, 1776. These dates show that the New York views were made probably not earlier than 1777, and perhaps not until 1778. Doubtless all the American views were engraved during the same period, and at a time when Boston, New York, and Philadelphia, on account of the Revolution, were attracting considerable attention in Europe, and the excitement from military or political events in America was fresh in the public mind.

The Views are unnumbered, though in the following description I shall speak of them by numbers, at the same time giving a free translation of the legends, and referring to the streets by their modern names.

No. I. has the legend, "View of the Great Street toward the Old South Presbyterian Church in Boston." The plate gives a view in Washington Street looking north from the Old South Meeting-house. A person familiar with the spot can possibly make out the head of Water Street and of State Street, with

the Old State House, though this is somewhat doubtful. The picture furnishes a typical German scene, and shows a few soldiers in the street marching by the side of a mounted gun.

No. II. has the legend, "View of King Street toward the Gate leading to the Country." Soldiers and citizens are seen in the foreground.

No. III. "View of Boston toward the Harbor," — a scene purely imaginary, though perhaps an attempt was made to represent the North Battery and the North Church, as given in the neighborhood.

No. IV. "View of the Street and the Town House," — perhaps a representation of a part of Washington Street, looking toward the Old South. Men and women, including two Indians, appear in the foreground.

These four engravings are so very inaccurate that I am by no means sure I have fully identified the various places.

Mr. JUSTIN WINSOR said that he had long been familiar with these views, and that he had seen a set which bore some traces of re-lettering. He was inclined to think they were old plates intended to represent some city in northern Europe, and that during our Revolutionary War they were revamped and again issued with new lettering describing them as views of Boston. He also pointed out some additions which he thought had been made after one of the plates was first engraved.

Mr. A. C. GOODELL, JR., then spoke as follows : —

I desire to exhibit to the Society an interesting document which has come to my hands since one o'clock this afternoon. It is a formal written declaration of emancipation in Massachusetts of a negro slave in 1776. The names of a distinguished grandson and of two even more illustrious great-grandsons of the author of this declaration are enrolled as members of this Society; and as all three of these gentlemen have been distinguished for their persistent and zealous opposition to the "wrong and outrage" with the report of which, as the pious Cowper declares, "the earth is filled," — the eloquent voice of the youngest of them even now resounding throughout the land from the national Senate Chamber in an impressive protest against what he deems the sapping of the

very foundations of republican government, — I feel that I may adduce this paper, as a sort of supplement to Francis Galton's writings on the Heredity of Genius, inasmuch as, taken in connection with the career of the writer's descendants, it is a remarkable illustration of the heredity of a high moral instinct. With your permission I will read the document. It is brief.

Know all men by these presents that I John Hoar of Lincoln in the County of Mid^ls in the colony of Massachusetts Bay in New England Gentleman — in consideration that my negro man Servant named Cuff Hath been a good and faithfull Servant unto me — and he now desiring to be made free: I do therefore by these presents for my Self fully and absolutely free and Discharge him the s^d Cuff to act for himself So long as he behaves and Conducts himself regularly and well — without the denial or contridiction of me his s^d master.

Witness my hand

JOHN HOAR

LINCOLN May 28th 1776

BENJAMIN DANFORTH

ABIJAH PEIRCE

Mr. WILLIAM S. APPLETON exhibited two very rare medals, and read the following communication: —

I always hesitate about bringing the subject of numismatics into this room; but I obtained last summer two medals of such exceptional interest numismatically and historically, that I have decided to exhibit them here, and to read a short account of their occasion and meaning. They are known to American collectors as the Oswego medal and the Diplomatic medal, and date from 1758 and 1792. The former, struck in the midst of the seven years' war, is of size 20, and bears the head of Louis XV., with the inscription, certainly never exceeded for arrogant assumption, LUDOVICUS XV ORBIS IMPERATOR 1758. And what was the occasion on which the medal with this high-sounding title was struck? What were the events which justified it? This is, or must be supposed to be, explained by the reverse, which shows four fortresses, with the inscription WESEL OSWEGO PORTMAHON EXPUG. S^{TI} DAVIDIS ARCE ET SOLO ÆQUATA. These four French victories, representing respectively Europe, America, Africa, and Asia, hardly figure in history as combats of importance, and, in fact, are not recorded on the roll of great events, but must be dili-

gently sought by the student of history who may read their almost unknown names.

Wesel was of course occupied by the French, when they crossed the Rhine in the spring of 1757. The capture of Oswego in 1756 was an event which at the time caused grief and indignation in the English colonies in America; but the whole number of prisoners taken was only 1,200 or 1,500, and the fate of Canada was in no way affected by this disaster. The fall of Port Mahon in the Mediterranean, made by the stress of circumstances to represent the continent of Africa, has a larger place in history because of ill-fated Admiral Byng, but had no appreciable effect on the course of events, and was wholly undone at the peace of 1763. Fort St. David was an English military post near Pondicherry in Hindostan, and was taken with about 2,000 prisoners, English and natives. The surrender excited the indignation of Clive, but interfered not at all with the gradual extension of British rule, and the almost complete expulsion of the French from India. The medal, in fact, is such a misrepresentation of history as is hardly equalled except by the medal of Napoleon to commemorate his great invasion, with the inscription *FRAPPÉE À LONDRES*; and of this no specimens were struck at the time.

Of the Diplomatic medal the origin and purpose were set forth in the "*American Journal of Numismatics*" for January, 1875; and its artistic merit in a paper which I read before this Society in March, 1890, on Augustin Dupré, and his work for America. The original broken dies are now in the Boston Public Library, and the medal proves that Dupré made a second set, as he omitted to put on them his name, which is found on the injured ones. The medal is a very beautiful one, but I will not undertake here to describe it technically. It is of size 43; and on the principal side the artist carried out Jefferson's idea of "Columbia (a fine female figure) delivering the emblems of Peace and Commerce to a Mercury."

Both medals are rare. I had been for some time trying to obtain the Oswego medal, and I never expected to become owner of a specimen of the Diplomatic medal. I know of only one other, which is in Philadelphia, and held at a price which positively prohibits its purchase. There may

possibly be more in existence, most likely in Europe, whence I obtained mine, but I have no idea where they can be found.

The Hon. Edward F. Johnson of Woburn was elected a Resident Member.

A new serial was on the table for distribution, containing the proceedings at the December and January meetings.